THEOLOGY

VOL. XLVII FEBRUARY, 1944 No. 284

Editorial

WE have been kindly taken to task for the infrequency of our editorials during the past year or so. This infrequency has been due to various causes; one of them is the circumstance that under present conditions our copy has to go to press about six weeks before publication. This makes it impossible to offer up-to-date comment on current events or on questions which are changing their form from month to month. Nevertheless, it is true that there are sufficient long-term problems to engage our attention, and we hope in future to comment on these more frequently.

The Church of England has an extraordinary aptitude for deferring its decisions. Again and again, not least during the last hundred years, it appeared that our Church had at last come to a parting of the ways; but, though some of its members have departed, the Church as a whole has just gone on, and the threats of disruption have not been realized. We are far from thinking that the Anglican aptitude for saying Yes and No at the same time, or at least in successive breaths, is altogether deplorable. It may correspond to the facts that theological truth is not simple, but paradoxical, that no Church, still less any group within a Church, is ever a hundred per cent. right, and that the unity of a Church depends on the acts and ordinances of God rather than on the notions and movements of its members.

If, in the providence of God, the Church of England has a special opportunity of witnessing to these facts, it is also exposed to the temptations of muddled thinking, slothful ambiguity, and diplomatic evasion. The temptations are the more subtle on account of the skill and accumulating experience of its leaders in adorning surrenders to them with the robes of magnanimity. The South India scheme of Church Union, which continues to engross more than its due share of attention, would afford an obvious illustration of this theme. We have seen no reason to modify what we said on the subject last April. We would emphasize that, whatever decisions are now taken in India or in England or elsewhere, they will not solve the underlying problems which this scheme raises for Anglican theology. The discussions that have been provoked have revealed a grave condition of theological unpreparedness. Arguments, on the one side and on the other, bear too many traces of improvisation. Is the Church of England clearer now than it was a century ago, at the time of the somewhat similar Jerusalem Bishopric crisis, as to the nature of its distinctive witness in Christendom? The value of such pamphlets as Mr T. S. Eliot's *Reunion by Destruction* (Pax House, 1s.), and the Open Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury from the Superiors of Certain Religious Communities entitled *The Unity of the Faith* (Dacre Press, 6d.), is that they fix attention on the seriousness and implications of this question. We

are not, however, so convinced as these writers that the South India scheme in itself, either logically or actually, brings the Anglican Communion to the parting of the ways. That depends on whether the scheme is regarded as a pattern for church union everywhere (which admittedly some of its advocates maintain) or as the least intolerable and least anomalous, and therefore best possible, way of dealing with an urgent pastoral and evangelistic situation that has arisen in a particular and peculiar locality.

On either view, the Church of England has, we hope, received a shock from which it will not complacently recover. We can see now that the Lambeth Quadrilateral no more settled the foundations of church unity than the Atlantic Charter settled the foundations of world peace. There is any amount of work still to be done down there, before a satisfactory superstructure can arise. The place and function of the episcopate in Church Order is one of these fundamental questions. Unless it can be shown to be bound up with the integrity of the Gospel, there is no warrant for treating it as indispensable. We are glad, therefore, to publish the Bishop of Southampton's essay on this subject.

But, above all, the Church at home must not allow itself to be so occupied with the controversy about South India, or even with the theoretical consideration of fundamental theological topics (though the latter danger is not at present a pressing one), as to be distracted from its immediate duty to the people of England. We are in close agreement with the admirable paper on "Some Questions for Anglicans," which Mr D. M. Mackinnon contributed to the December number of *Christendom*. Thought which is detached from the possibility of responsible action is always seductive and always perilous. What kind of action is required in the reader's locality by the considerations that are adduced in Mr Saxon's article on "Community and Worship"?

The Prophetic Character of Episcopacy

I START with two presuppositions about the Christian ministry which appear to me to be incontestable.

The first is that all ministries in the Church are "charismatic" and that the attempt to distinguish between a teaching ministry of the Spirit as charismatic and an official local ministry as non-charismatic fails. The argument presented by Dr Armitage Robinson and endorsed by Canon A. J. Mason in *The Early History of the Church and Ministry* seems to me to be convincing on this point and I do not propose to repeat what they say.[1]

My second presupposition is that the regular ministry of the Church is intended by God to be both priestly and prophetic in character. It is sometimes claimed that, whereas "Catholic" ministries are priestly, Free Church ministries are prophetic; that they are different in kind and complementary to each other. Dr N. P. Williams, for example,

[1] See *op. cit.*, pp. 60-79 and 30-33.

writes: "It is congruous with the twofold method of God's approach to men, through His Incarnate Word living and dying *for* them, and His Spirit moving *in* them, that the Christian Church should have included a twofold ministry; one branch of it objective, orderly, institutional, tracing its being and authority to acts of the Incarnate Word, performed by His human hands and lips in space and time—the other irregular, sporadic, incalculable, vouched for by none except interior and subjective guarantees, raised up to meet particular emergencies or situations by the viewless energizing of the Spirit 'dividing to each one severally even as He will.' "[1]

The former he equates with the Apostolic (p. 17) and later the Priestly (p. 20); the latter with the Prophetic ministry. After referring to the tendency for priest and prophet to be at loggerheads he continues: "This tendency of priest and prophet to drift into mutual opposition consummated itself in the cataclysm of the Reformation, as the result of which great areas of the Church lost the official or Apostolic ministry altogether and retained none but the Prophetic. Where this has happened, the Prophetic ministry has, doubtless inevitably, taken over the administration of the Sacraments, and to a greater or lesser extent the rule of the Church. And this development, which might well have been justified from the point of view of liberal traditionalism as an emergency measure, until the Apostolic ministry could be restored, has become stereotyped and inveterate: so that it is now the more or less official doctrine or at least belief of the areas of the Church in question that there is no ministry other than the Prophetic; that the forms which this Prophetic ministry may assume are merely a matter of practical convenience; that ordination is not the impartation of a spiritual endowment to man, but merely the official recognition that he already possesses such an endowment; and that the Apostolic ministry, in so far as it claims to be more or other than a form of the Prophetic ministry, is a delusion."[2]

I cannot believe that the Catholic ministry has been or is priestly without being prophetic as Dr Williams seems to imply, or that the Free Church ministry is only prophetic—still less that the one is objective and the other "vouched for by none but interior and subjective guarantees." The implication seems to be that the ministry of the Word is prophetic and the ministry of the Sacraments is priestly. Even this is not true, and in any case the ministry is admittedly "of the Word *and* Sacraments."

From two points of view it might be claimed that there are two elements in ministry, though they are never separable in the minister. In view of the fact that the Spirit's work is both conservative and creative ("He will take of mine, and show it unto you"; "He will lead you into all the truth"), the priestly aspect of ministry corresponds to the conservative work of the Spirit, the prophetic to the creative.

Or it might be said in seeming contradiction to the above that there is a distinction between the analytic and the synthetic aspects of ministry. On the one side it must be a ministry of discerning and

[1] *Lausanne, Lambeth and South India*, p. 16. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 20-21.

penetrating insight, of judgment, revealing to people the truth about themselves, piercing by the Word of God even to the dividing of soul and spirit, of both joints and marrow. On the other side it must be a constructive ministry of *paraclesis*, encouragement, blessing and absolution.

However we look at it the ministry of the Word is priestly as well as prophetic, and the ministry of the Sacraments is prophetic as well as priestly, witness St Augustine's assimilation of the Word and Sacraments and Hugh of St Victor's idea that the function of the Sacrament is to "unfilm the spiritual eye so that it may perceive true meanings." A prophetic ministry without the priestly may be utterly discouraging and killing. A priestly ministry without the prophetic may be harmful in invoking the divine blessing on wrong attitudes. To adapt a phrase of Dr Quick's, "Prophecy is in some sense the salt of Christianity. The crime and tragedy of our unhappy divisions lie in this, that they have separated the salt from the meat."

On my two presuppositions Episcopacy is charismatic, and we may expect to find in it a prophetic as well as a priestly character. What is there in history to suggest a prophetic character in the Episcopal Office?

1. All Christian ministry is derived from our Lord, and if we examine the nature of His authority we must admit it to be in part prophetic. He is not, of course, only a prophet in the sense admitted by the Koran, but combines in His Messiahship the character of Prophet, Priest and King. Such antagonism as existed under the Old Covenant between priest and prophet is done away in Him. He certainly fulfilled the character of the Hebrew prophet in that He was the recipient of direct communications from Yahweh and discerned the signs of the times. In His rejection He received the fate of a prophet. The nature of His authority is clearly seen in the events immediately before His Crucifixion. In leading the people in a traditional Messianic Liturgy, the Triumphal Entry, He claimed authority as Priest and King. The cleansing of the Temple was a great prophetic act done with a view to freeing Israel from its enslavement to vested interests and recalling it to its *mission*. It was only natural that the chief priests and scribes and elders should ask by what authority He did these things, and our Lord's answer was in effect that His authority was not political[1] but the same as that of John the Baptist—*i.e.*, essentially prophetic.[2]

2. If we accept Harnack's contention that the first ministry of the Church was a missionary "general" ministry consisting, he would say, of Apostles, Prophets and Teachers, and that as they founded Churches they appointed a local stationary ministry which by the early years of the second century was recognized as a ministry of Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, and agree that the former ministries disappear and the latter remain, then the transition from the one type to the other requires explanation.

Given the character of the Church as it is revealed in the New Testament, and the fact that "the principle of mission runs through the

[1] Luke xxii, 25-27. [2] Mark xi, 27-33; *cf.* the discourse in John viii, 12 to end.

whole conception of office in the New Testament,"[1] it is unthinkable that the general missionary worldwide character of the ministry should disappear, and if we ask what happened to it the only reasonable answer is that it was incorporated into what had hitherto been a purely local ministry, and so brought the ministry to the fullness of its stature as both universal and at the same time territorially attached to a particular place.

This is in fact the view taken both by Harnack and C. H. Turner. Harnack says: "The superiors of the individual community owe the high position which they finally attained mainly to the circumstance that the most important functions of the ministers of the Church at large—the Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers—in course of time, as these died out or lost their significance, passed over to them" (Harnack, quoted by C. H. Turner, p. 9).

And C. H. Turner: "It is true to say that the ministry of Bishops and Presbyters as a whole supplanted the ministry of the Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers; but it is equally representative of the development to say that the supreme power of the first system, residing in the Apostles and Prophets, survives in a completed episcopacy as its representative, while the subordinate function of the teachers is preserved in the subordinate office of the presbyters."[2]

And again: "The bishop is connected, simultaneously and equally, with two lines of ancestry, with the presbyteral office of the primitive *episcopos* and with the apostolic and prophetic office, which combined together to realise the bishop."

3. The evidence for this is admittedly scanty. The fact that some Bishops, Ignatius, for example, Polycarp, Quadratus, and Melito of Sardis, were recognized as possessing prophetic gifts does not prove that prophecy was inherent in the episcopal office, though Ignatius appears to combine in his office that of a prophet called to a universal mission with an episcopate territorially attached.

There is significance in the fact that the privilege accorded to the prophets to "hold Eucharist as they will" is also given, according to Hippolytus, to bishops:

> And the bishop shall give thanks (celebrate the Eucharist), according to the aforesaid models. It is not altogether necessary for him to recite the very same words which we gave before as though studying to say them by heart in his thanksgiving to God; but let each one pray according to his own ability.[3]

4. The rise and fall of Montanism is at least indirectly germane to our inquiry. Episcopacy is associated with the bestowal of the gift of the Spirit in consecration, ordination, and confirmation; and this presumably presupposes the existence of the gift in the bestower. The positive witness of Montanism, despite its crude aberrations in rigorism, ecstasy and Chiliasm, was to the contemporary inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Its theology was orthodox. (The original prophets of the sect) "were quite orthodox, accepted fully the doctrinal teachings

[1] C. H. Turner, *Studies in Early Church History*, p. 12. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 24.
[3] *The Apostolic Tradition*, x, 3 and 4.

of the Catholic Church, and did not pretend to alter in any way the revelation given by Christ and His apostles. But they claimed that some things had not been revealed by them because at that early stage the Church was not able to bear them."[1] Montanism aroused a general distrust of prophecy, but *abusus non tollit usum*, and the distinction between true and false prophecy, however difficult to define, is real.

The Catholics in condemning Montanism were no doubt acting in the face of a grave danger, but were themselves open to the charge of building the tombs of the prophets by witnessing only to the conservative work of the Spirit and ignoring, if not denying, His creative work.[2] The Church suffered injury in her condemnation of Montanism, but the gift of the Spirit remained in its fullness, conservative and creative, in the Church, in spite of the tendency of the Catholics to repudiate the contemporary inspiration of the Spirit. The Spirit of Prophecy remained part of the endowment of the Episcopate even though there is no explicit recognition of it in the accounts of Consecration given in the *Apostolic Tradition*.

But we may note in passing that the author of the *Tradition*, Hippolytus, is described by Dom Gregory Dix as "one of the Canutes of Christian history who have imagined that the tradition which befits the Churches must cease to advance when it reaches them and petrify for ever in their formulation of it."[3]

May we not claim that the Montanist movement represented at once a fulfilment and a fiasco? Though the Church at the time was not fully aware of it, the condemnation of Montanism was at once a repudiation of false prophecy and an incorporation of true prophecy as "contemporary inspiration of the Holy Spirit" into the normal life of the Church. To quote Turner once more, "the prophetic charisma must exist in the whole Church till the consummation of the Parousia" (*op. cit.*, p. 23).

5. Finally, support is given to our theory in the following note by Canon Frederick Hood, of Pusey House.[4]

> Historically *the* organ, irreplaceable in all vital acts of the Church, has been the episcopate. Recent study of the subject tends to show that the episcopate is in origin not a mere organ of government—which in early ages centred in the presbyterate rather than the bishop—but a liturgical ministry. The bishop (who in the fourth century is still called exclusively the *sacerdos*) is the priest who offers the eucharistic worship of the Church, because he is pre-eminently the person endowed with the Spirit, whom he confers on every Christian at initiation by the gift which we now know as Confirmation. As such, too, he is the *ex officio* prophet of the Church (an idea very prominent, *e.g.*, in Ignatius and Cyprian) and therefore her authorized teacher, the supreme doctrinal authority, as the Church was to insist in opposition to the Gnostics.

---

[1] Note on Eusebius, Book V, Ch. xvi, Wace and Schaff.

[2] *E.g.*, Hippolytus, *Apostolic Tradition*. i, 5: "The Holy Ghost bestows the fulness of grace on those who believe rightly, that they may know how those who are at the head of the Church should teach the tradition and maintain it in all things."

[3] Dix, *Apostolic Tradition*, Introduction, page L.

[4] From the Appendix to *Some Problems connected with the Proposed Scheme of Church Union in South India*, by the Bishop of Colombo, S.P.C.K., 1s.

It remains to draw out some aspects of the prophetic character of the episcopate.

1. The primary duty of the bishop is Godward, to draw upon the life and virtue with which the Body of Christ is filled through the operation of the Spirit, and in the power of the same Spirit to offer it to God in union with our Lord's High Priestly Offering. In present-day circumstances he is to discern, with wisdom and understanding and charity, the spirit and *ethos* which inform the corporate activities of and in his diocese, of chapters and parishes, colleges and schools, voluntary societies and organs of local government, industrial and commercial undertakings, not forgetting the activities of other Christian Communions; to pray for them and bring them to God for His cleansing and blessing.

2. It is his duty to declare the truth as it is in Christ, as the Spirit leads him into it. To him is given the Spirit's power to guard given truth and to lead into all the truth.

The conservative aspect of this, the guardianship of true doctrine, is amply recognized as part of the bishop's work, but the prophetic element in his office requires him also to "lead into all the truth"—that is, to unfold the meaning of the inexhaustible riches of Christ, to be the channel through which the Spirit can reveal and declare the mind of Christ in the contemporary situation. The very fact that to him is committed the bestowal of the Spirit, not only in Confirmation, but in Ordination and Consecration, is evidence of the fact that he is intended by God to be the channel of the Spirit. He must therefore himself be "full of the Holy Ghost and of faith," and continually stir up the dormant gifts of the Spirit in those upon whom they have been bestowed (2 Tim. i, 6).

3. In relation to unity the bishop's function is to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.[1] All unity is unity "in Christ"—*i.e.*, in a Person—and the bishop is the living Sacrament of this unity in Christ, and must therefore be a unifying person.

4. The bishop is the instrument of the continuity of the Church, which requires a succession of living agents, all filled with the same Spirit.

5. The bishop is the Sacrament of the transcendent authority of the Spirit, which is the authority of the historic living Christ, whose authority we have seen above to be essentially prophetic.

6. This question of the authority of the bishop has of course been the cause of bitter controversy, bound up as it is with the question of validity. It is, for example, sometimes suggested that the bishop's authority exists, if not solely, at least chiefly, in order to confer valid orders and valid confirmation. The old lines of controversy are familiar. Validity depends upon episcopal succession, and the orders of those who have lost or rejected the succession are consequently invalid. To which those whose orders are thus impugned reply that their orders are as regular as, and often more effective, more fully endowed with the Spirit than, those possessed of technical validity. And the rejoinder

[1] See Ignatius' *Epistles*, *passim*.

comes back that validity and effectiveness are not the same thing, and the distinction is only confused by resort to the word "reality." This is a dead end, and we are groping after another way through to the promised land of reunion.

All ecclesiastical authority would claim to be theocratic, whether as a matter of history it has taken the form of episcopacy, presbyterianism or congregationalism. In other words, all forms of ecclesiastical authority are intended to bear witness to, to express, to be instruments of, the Divine authority. The purpose of ecclesiastical authority is, on the negative side, to "hinder hindrances to the Spirit of God," to be a "dyke against sin,"[1] to curb irresponsible power in "authorities" in order to preserve freedom with order; and on the positive side to give reasonable assurance to the worshipper that he is receiving God's gifts and not man's, and as God meant them to be received, not as man thinks they ought to be received.

Its purpose is, in fact, to reflect and reproduce the authority of Christ as Prophet, Priest, and promised Messiah. Only the Word, the Christ, the Truth, the Universal Gospel can be said to be wholly *βέβαιος*, firm, unshakable, valid. As Sacraments or witnesses of this divine validity there are three strands of validity in the Church—the scriptural, the prophetic and the priestly. A valid and therefore authoritative ministry is one which witnesses to this threefold *βεβαιότης*, and the worshipper has the right to expect it in its threefold form in every liturgical act in which he joins. Episcopacy has been rightly associated with sound learning in the Scriptures. If it has a prophetic, in addition to its recognized priestly, character, then we can surely claim that its authority rests on a threefold cord of validity.

May it not be that the existing episcopate needs the enrichment of the scriptural and prophetic validity preserved in non-episcopal ministries to restore it to the fullness of its strength and splendour?

EDMUND SOUTHAMPTON.

WINCHESTER.

Community and Worship

IN the discussions which are at present proceeding on the reorganization of the Church's life, one notices a tendency to treat the whole subject on a level which does not raise a fundamental problem. This may be briefly stated as the relationship of the parish to the civil society as it actually functions in the twentieth century. The superficial approach to the subject takes the form of renewed evangelistic efforts—directed possibly by a Central Commission from Westminster; or of increased and hectic exertions on the part of the clergy to prove themselves second to none as club leaders; or, worst of all, of the attempt to infuse new life into the parochial system just as it is, as though it were divinely given and unalterable.

Any analysis of the present position must begin with the history of

[1] I owe the phrases to W. G. Symons' note on "The Church Meeting" in *The Presbyter*, Spetember, 1943.

the parish pump. In the days when there was one pump and one street and one church, the parish was a natural Christian community. Since the days of William and Lanfranc the Church and State had been regarded as a single community under two aspects. The same can be said of the parish. Until as late as 1894 the effective organ of local government was the Vestry Meeting, and the functions of the civil and ecclesiastical authorities were in the hands of the same body.[1] Thus the parochial system corresponded admirably with the social life of a predominantly rural England. The parson had a recognized and indeed central place in the sociological structure of the country as well as in the ecclesiastical structure of the Church of England. The effectiveness of his work was due to this circumstance. He had a definite public status which was accepted by society as a whole. There was no question of the Church's intruding itself into a sphere which was not proper to it, since it was there already. The growth of local government in the past century had perforce to utilize the existing living units of social life in order to be effective, and it is no surprise to find that the parishes were recognized as these living units, because no others existed. How far the social revolution has proceeded is clearly seen if one considers the reception which would be accorded to-day to the suggestion that the Parochial Church Council of Muddlecombe should become the Borough Council!

Since the Local Government Act of 1835 this country has witnessed a social revolution of unprecedented magnitude. There has been a change-over from a predominantly rural society of small units to a predominantly industrial society of ever-increasing complexity. The ineffectiveness of the Vestry Meeting to control these larger areas has led to the introduction of Rural and Urban District Councils, Borough, County Borough, and County Councils. The more complex social life has become, the farther has it gone from the parochial unit. The Vestry has gradually been shorn of its civil functions until to-day it is to all intents and purposes ignored. At the beginning of the last century it was the effective functioning unit, but the impact of industrial society has reduced its status to nil. The parish is no longer the living expression of the sociological life of the people. It survives only as an ecclesiastical administrative area, which in some cases has become quite anomalous even in this respect.

Gone are the days of one pump, one street and one church. The pump has been replaced by the County or Borough Waterworks Committee; the street has become a narrow winding lane causing confusion to motorists and pedestrians alike; the church has become an interesting historical building on the outskirts of the new town. The parish area is now simply a section of the larger district in which the people live and work and amuse themselves. Parishes are measured by the size of the population—*i.e.*, the number to which one man, with perhaps some assistance from curates, can reasonably be expected to minister. They have no longer, especially in urban areas, any correspondence with "functioning society," to use Drucker's term. Parishes,

[1] C. M. Ady, *The English Church*, p. 77.

notably the larger proportion that are mainly working class or suburban, have become isolated from the social structure of the country. Probably the most effective parishes are those which still retain the ancient lines and fall into easy social units, as for instance in the smaller Urban and Rural Districts where people may still live and work in the same areas. But even here the position of the parson reflects the divorce between the parish and the Urban or Rural District. It is only by grace that the Council may keep up an association with the Parish Church, in the annual "Churching of the Chairman" service. The parson has no standing such as his predecessor a hundred years ago and earlier possessed.

But this is by no means the end of the story. One of the reasons why the earlier parish was an effective functioning unit was that the inhabitants had lived there for many generations. Community life is ultimately spiritual, resulting from the close and enduring relationships between the members of a society, and it cannot be created overnight. Community can only exist therefore in a relatively stable society, where knowledge of one's neighbours "unto the third and fourth generations" has produced a common *ethos*. This is always true in every type of community and is illustrated by the time that it takes for new arrivals to be accepted in a village or the parish church. Now the population of this country has, to an amazing degree, become mobile in the past twenty-five years. It is not always realized how many people have been affected by this mobility. The following facts and figures bring out the implications of this transference of population.

If we take as rough basis the figure of twelve and a half million households in this country, it will be seen that well over half the population have changed their domicile since the last war. Between 1919 and 1939 the number of new houses built was 3,998,000.[1] Only a small percentage of these were to replace houses pulled down by slum clearance; thus nearly double that number of removals have taken place, even if we allow for only one change per house. Hence we reach the conclusion that the parishes of this country have suffered the double blow of old residents moving out and new ones moving in, a process which is all the time going on. In this way the community sense which is fundamental to cohesive social life has both been destroyed in old areas and has had insufficient time to develop in the new ones.

Here a little personal experience is relevant. The place where I am working is an Urban District on the outskirts of Manchester. Fifteen years ago it had a population of 12,000, but since then another 15,000 have moved into new houses built on outlying land on one side of the town. They have come mainly from five or six parishes situated nearer the city, and if they have a parochial loyalty it is to the parish in which they were brought up. Until their advent the town had something of the old community life, because the seven large mills were owned and managed by local residents and the people lived and worked in the same place. It was even true that the Church life reflected the social

[1] G. and E. G. McAllister, *Town and Country Planning*.

distinctions, with the wardens and church officers mill owners or managers. But now that has nearly all disappeared. The owners have gone to more "respectable" districts and the people in the town more often than not work in Manchester, while the mills are largely staffed by people from other districts. The influx of new residents has made the old ones feel that both the town and the church are no longer their own. They do not know everybody and the sense of community, where it exists, is sustained by artificial means.

The newcomers are a problem all on their own. They have not yet been integrated with the life of the town. Their roots are as yet only a little below ground and it is questionable whether those over thirty will ever call the place their own. The children, because they are at school together, stand a better chance of creating and sharing in a local tradition. But for the most part the new residents are "rootless" individuals. Their spiritual life is attached to a parish in which they no longer live; their cultural associations have been severed at the roots; they have no real neighbours, and for their pleasures they prefer to go to the pictures, where they sit in the dark and cannot see or be seen by others, a significant reflection of their outlook on society. They are the individualists *par excellence*. Niebuhr accurately describes them in these words:

> The unpolitical, desocialized creature, who lives in a modern urban apartment house, a dwelling full of people without any neighbours, subsisting on the proceeds of the labour of others, with whom he has not the slightest human contacts, is the pathetic product and spiritual victim of a decadent and individualistic culture and civilization.[1]

This individualism is further seen in the attitude of people to the religious life of the parish. Practically everyone makes use of the occasional offices of the parish church, but only because they touch him in those areas of life which still remain personal. Baptism in particular is valued because it gives the child a name and not because it makes him a member of the Church. Again, it is comparatively easy to persuade people to listen to wireless services because these give "religion" on a level which fits in with their general outlook—*i.e.*, on an individualistic basis; they can listen in their own homes. But it is next to impossible to persuade them to become members of the worshipping community. And if my reasoning is correct this is primarily because they are not yet a community in the social sense and therefore *church* worship is meaningless to them. In Dr Mess' phrase, they are still a "β-society" and have not risen to those willed relationships which constitute a "γ-society."[2]

Dr Mess defines a society as "a number of persons whose lives affect one another substantially, together with their relationships and their

---

[1] R. Niebuhr, *End of an Era*, p. 93.

[2] An α-society is an unstable one, the mere interaction of a crowd. A β-society is a stage beyond this where mutual awareness exists, but where social life is not fully integrated or developed. A γ-society is the most highly developed one, in which the members have willingly entered into responsible relationships with one another. H. A. Mess, *Social Structure*, p. 12.

set modes of thought and behaviour." There are different levels of integration of the lives of the persons making up the society, and advance in social consciousness lies in the deepening of the significance of the mutual relationships between those persons. Owing to the impact on the social structure of the wholesale removal of people from one area to others, we have in England groups of people in all stages of development. Awareness of this fact constitutes one of the major points in this discussion. The parochial system has suffered severely from this process, and the homogeneity of most parishes has been destroyed from within. The present system was designed for a stable order of society which had reached the level of a "γ-society," whereas it finds itself faced with a situation with which it is powerless to deal alone. Being a survivor of a division of English society which has now passed away, the parochial system is forced to fight a weary battle against almost hopeless odds, and at best succeeds only in artificially infusing life into a defunct unit of society. For the parish cannot fight its battle for community life alone. A congregation of worshippers is only a small section and one aspect of the whole community. Until society in general can recreate its own life, until the present chaos of local authorities is resolved by a new Local Government Act, and until rehousing is controlled on better lines, parishes will be confronted with the almost insuperable task of creating worshipping communities in places where community itself does not exist. If the parochial system is to survive as a living expression of the sociological structure of English life, it must both reorganize itself and also enter vigorously into the present struggle to create order and community on levels below that of worship.

The problem may be studied from the biblical angle. In the development of O.T. religion we see the clear interrelation of civil and religious conceptions. Oesterley and Robinson state that "Israel came into existence with Moses."[1] He it was who did a dual work. He both created the nation and was also the instrument through which its religion took definite shape. "Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me from among all peoples: for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation" (Exod. xix, 5, 6). This promise was followed first by the Decalogue and then by the civil code in the Book of the Covenant. From that time the history of Israel and her religion were inseparably linked. The line is clear through Samuel, the prophet-statesman, to the Davidic monarchy, when Nathan and Gad were both religious and political advisers to the King, who represented in his own person the unity of the two priestly and kingly functions. The nation of Israel was the people of God. Davidson comments: "The sense of being a people, and the sense of being the people of Jehovah, if not identical feelings, reacted very powerfully on one another; and hence the religious literature of the people reflects from age to age all the changing hues of its history."[2] It was because of the general religious consciousness of the Jewish nation that the later prophets were thrown up. They spoke in living historical circumstances

[1] Oesterley and Robinson, *History of Israel*, I, 67.
[2] Davidson, *The Theology of the Old Testament*, p. 23.

the word of God to the community of God. We need go no deeper into the history of Israel in order to see that her advance as a worshipping community was intimately linked with her historical unity. The worship of Israel did not develop *in vacuo* but was rooted in the community life as a whole.

To return, then, to our problem of the relation of the parish to the functioning society, the following points must be borne in mind. The conception of a Church located in society and sharing in the whole life of the community is fundamentally a sound one. We are not suggesting that the parish can be done away with and be replaced by clergy working in specialized spheres of the social life of the community. But on the other hand a form of congregationalism, in which the worshipping congregation is a spiritual oasis in a desert of otherwise secular activities, is intolerable. If the Church of England is to continue to be in any real sense the National Church, it must get into active relations with the national life as it is now organized. It must boldly face the changes that will be necessary in order to bring its administrative machinery into line with the communal divisions of the country. Otherwise it will sink into the position of an old-fashioned sect or become a curious survival of the past like the Cinque Ports.

The parochial system will survive if the parish can once more be plainly and fully related to the society in which it is situated. In those areas where there does exist a community life in matters of local government and culture, the parishes may have to be reorganized to correspond to the social structure already in existence. There are many towns with a population of about 50,000 where there does exist a real community sense. Indeed, some authorities favour a population of this size as being large enough to cope with many of the technical problems of administration, while at the same time not too big to destroy the unity and community of civic life. But at present, in a town like this, the Church has no community comparable to the civic community. There may be six or seven parishes. Each of these will possess a worshipping congregation of its own, none of which reflects faithfully the social and cultural life of the town. The old parish church will be situated near the centre and draw its congregation from outlying parishes, while the poorer residents of the city centre will fight shy of going there. They prefer to go to the working-class church in the back streets. On one side of the town the lower middle classes live and attend one or other of the two churches situated in the areas in which they reside. The wealthier, more suburban classes have a church composed of people of their own outlook. None of these churches is really a parish church, for they all fall into the category of congregations, not communities. A hundred years ago the old parish church really was *the* parish church, fulfilling its dual functions through the Vestry Meeting with the parson in the chair.

The obvious line of development lies in some co-ordination of the several parishes within the one community. One co-ordinating instrument lies ready to hand if it were used for its true purpose. The Ruri-decanal Chapter, now unhappily laxly attended because many people regard it as superfluous, would blossom into new life if it became

the source and inspiration of the ecclesiastical life of the town. It would become once more in fact a chapter, guiding the spiritual life of the whole deanery. In this case the deanery might fulfil the functions exercised by the old parish. This would not necessarily mean the loss of the parson's freehold, because real government by chapter does not mean mere majority rule, but the discovery and framing of a common purpose under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. It is not another "committee," but the body of ordained men with the cure of souls in that district. Within this body there will be those whose abilities lie in certain directions and whose services will now be available for the use of all.[1] This chapter is the only body which can be placed over against the local authority, which will be quick to recognize the value of the co-ordination of the spiritual and temporal affairs of the town. This suggestion is at once less drastic and far more feasible than the idea of uniting parishes which is set out in *Putting Our House in Order*,[2] though quite clearly there are some areas where such grouping is essential, especially in the larger cities.

The industrial parishes of these larger cities present far graver problems. How is the parochial system of an unwieldy city, such as Manchester, to be adjusted to the existing social life of the area? The city as a whole does not possess a real civic life, since it is far too large to evoke the sentiments which naturally arise in a smaller town. In fact those urban districts which have been absorbed into the city area have tended to disintegrate socially. The parishes, on the other hand, are simply blocks of unrelated population, whose ecclesiastical boundaries bear no relation to the realities of the present social structure. Many parishes, especially those near the centre of the city, are condemned to the position of hanging on to their existence with little more than their teeth. Only on the outskirts is there a chance for the parochial system, as at present constituted, to work. The whole situation is complicated by the wholesale transference of population referred to above. If here the R.D. Chapters are to operate effectively, the chapters themselves will have to be reorganized and new ones created. They will need to correspond with those communal divisions which have arisen and will arise in the course of the development of civic life. There is one R.D. Chapter which has its H.Q. in Manchester, and which sweeps in two independent U.D.C.s and, not content with this, sends out a long arm into a neighbouring city. The R.D. Chapter in this case would not be a more effective functioning unit than the traditional parishes. But those parishes which are in Manchester could easily be included in one chapter and the other parishes linked together on an adequate sociological basis. Obviously some new rural deaneries —or *urban* deaneries—would have to be created, but in a paper of this size it is impossible to discuss in detail projects which depend so much on local conditions.

In the new housing areas a completely new situation exists. Merely to erect houses and shops does not create a community. Only time and the right cultural and social relations can do that. As Father Roseveare

[1] *Putting Our House in Order*, p. 42 *ff.*

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 40.

says, "When people are moved out in vast numbers they take some time to shake down into a new community. If the Church is there in good time much may be done in the building up of that new community life upon Christian foundations." "The vast estates now beginning to grow up in this country are the places in which (please God) the Church may once again try to establish itself as a living organism leavening the new lump and determined not to repeat the failures of the nineteenth-century industrial cities."[1] The Church here has the chance of reviving the old conception lying behind the Vestry Meeting, if it regards the worship of the new and developing community as involving concern in civic affairs. One may hope that, in the new satellite towns which are being planned on the lines of Wythenshawe, new parishes will not simply be carved out and tacked on to the nearest R.D. Chapter, but that each town will be treated as a unity, a basis on which the religious community may be built.

Throughout the discussion I have not attempted to deal with the non-Anglican religious bodies. Obviously a complete and satisfactory solution of the relation between the religious and social life of parishes would have to take into account this additional factor. The work of the British Council of Churches is bringing the denominations closer together than ever before, and recently a Manchester Council of Churches has been formed. But it will be a long time before any thoroughgoing working unity between the Churches is reached. In any case the Church of England claims to be, and still in theory is acknowledged to be, the National Church, and it must envisage and get ahead with its task on the ground of that claim.

So far this article has dealt with the mechanics of a revitalized parochial life. It has been concerned to suggest how the parochial system may recover that natural and spiritual unity which lay behind the ancient conception of the parish, and to outline a way in which the congregations of our Churches may become in fact worshipping communities. The worship of the Church is the end and crown of true community life. It is false to think that concentration on new methods of evangelism and public worship will by itself achieve this end. This paper is written in the belief that prior to and also running alongside these things there must be a serious attempt to grapple with the sociological problems involved in a community of any kind.

AUDENSHAW. ERIC SAXON.

CORRESPONDENCE

"RENASCENCE"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Your request that I should reply to the criticisms of *Renascence* in the November and December issues of THEOLOGY is one which, though reluctant, I cannot refuse. To some criticism the only adequate

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 123, 124.

reply is silence, but that of Bro. Every and Mr Reckitt is of another order; the issues which they raise claim a serious and concerned response.

Bro. Every's criticism draws inferences from my book which are quite contrary to that which I have written and believe or can, I suggest, justifiably be drawn from it. He infers from my statement of belief that personality is, in man, a "process of becoming" and that "if we seek the perfect personality . . . (except we seek in Christ) we deceive ourselves" that (to quote Bro. Every) I have implied that "few of us ever attain to personality" and that "these few . . . must live apart in communities." The inference is Bro. Every's: it is not mine.

He goes on to infer that because I have stated my belief that "fertility-faith" is contrary to Christianity I therefore assume that "spirituality" and "fertility" (terms which I have not used) are opposed. Here again is an inference for which the text gives no justification at all. On the contrary I have written (p. 154) that a Christianity "which is not concurrently concerned with the obedient cultivation and restoration of both soil and soul, with the *ars spiritualis* as well as with the art of agriculture, falls short of its true vocation . . ." It is a belief which I share with Mr Massingham, for whose *Tree of Life* I endorse Mr Reckitt's appreciation. The love and care of natural life is one thing; the worship and propitiation of "health, wealth and fecundity," Baal for God, is quite another. The first I believe to be profoundly Christian, the second an abominable idolatry. It is a belief which has the best Scriptural authority. It is this, and not what Bro. Every infers, that I believe and have written.

Again, Bro. Every infers that what I have written concerning a "federal faith" (possibly, I agree with Mr Reckitt, a misleading phrase) in which the Christian can meet with the majority of men of goodwill is conceived as a sufficient faith for Christian community. I have written the precise opposite—that the Christian can only meet such non-Christian men of goodwill "upon the circumference of an orb of faith in Being of which the core remains an undiluted Christianity."

When Bro. Every does comment upon what I have really said he dismisses it with a depreciatory and question-begging epithet. The evil economy which I have discussed in the chapter called "The Skin Game" is, he says, "familiar" to him; yet he appears to deplore the fact that, for a Christian, that scandal should seem "sensational." If that economy is not only "familiar" but fact, as I have maintained, which is the more Christian course—to resign oneself silently to a "familiar" evil or to make a sensation about it till it is ended? The prophetic indictment of social iniquity seems to merit the same dispraise which Bro. Every awards to me; it can scarcely be termed unsensational. If Bro. Every would confront and criticize what I have said rather than what he infers me to believe his criticism would be of more value both to me and to others.

In his acute, generous and charitable letter Mr Maurice Reckitt reaches, I think, far more close to the quick of the real question. With much of his kindly stricture I can only penitently agree. For I know, perhaps even better than he, how often, in my wrestling with these great themes, I have been thrown and how much remains that

is "confused and confusing" in a book written out of (not from above) a "confused and confusing" battle.

That very fact, Mr Reckitt's comment upon it and his appeal to "Catholic orthodoxy," the "Authority" (the capital letter is not without significance) of the Church and her sacramental system reveals the real contrast (not conflict) between those who approach these problems from his and from my *point d'appui*. It is, I think, the contrast between what may be called the dogmatic and the existential modes of thought, between thinking which sets out from an existential experience of life and that which is based upon dogma and "summa."

Field-Marshal Smuts has recently stated the existential attitude. "We are facing to-day," he said, "probably the most perplexing, complicated human situation that has confronted the world for many generations, and anybody who thinks that he has a panacea at his command to deal with these problems must either be sub-human or super-human."

The religious (it is also the human) situation is, I believe, no less "perplexing" and "complicated" and no more patient to panaceas. But, as I read Mr Reckitt and those whom he represents, in her authoritative and canonized dogma, in the Tridentine Thomist "summa," in a Catholic *philosophia perennis*, the Church (the visible, historic Church) is held to have such a panacea—a superhuman one. The theology which measures life with that great yardstick need leave no loose ends. The existential thinking which eschews such yardsticks of truth can but be provisional, tentative and, to some extent, "confused and confusing." Here is the clash of contraries between, in Professor Hodgson's phrase, "the sons of the Reformation and the heirs of Trent," between a "left"- and a "right"-wing Christianity.

I can do no more here and now than suggest those contrary approaches; their development demands a book. I believe profoundly that a Christian co-ordination of those contraries is to be found; its discovery is, perhaps, the most urgent task of our time and it is in such a charity of mind as Mr Reckitt has shown that such a meeting of polar opposites becomes possible. For I am very sure that, for left-wing Christianity, for existential Christian thinking, the concepts of the Church, orthodoxy, catholicity and dogma have a significance and authority no less vital—an authority of another order, of the spirit rather than of the letter.

For the rest, Mr Reckitt has himself given the only and, it seems to me, the adequate answer to his criticism that, in this book, I have not considered the Church or the Sacraments; these great matters did not fall within either its scope or my competence; that of which one does not lightly speak is not necessarily lightly regarded. But Mr Reckitt also states that my book "contains scarcely any reference to the Incarnate Lord." In a criticism otherwise so scrupulously just this statement is the more surprising. I have turned some fifty pages of the book at random; I found that great Name twenty-seven times. That "renascence" implies "rebirth in Christ" is the constant refrain not only of *Renascence* but also of *Midnight Hour*.

Yours faithfully,

NICODEMUS.

December 5, 1943.

BOOK REVIEWS

REDEEMING THE TIME. By J. Maritain. Translated by H. L. Binsse. Centenary Press. 12s. 6d.

A new book by M. Maritain is important because it is his. For M. Maritain writes with a humane discernment and a Christian wisdom which illuminate the subjects which he touches for many besides those of his own communion. This book is a collection of essays on various themes: on present political and social discontents in the light of Catholic teaching; on the philosophies of Bergson and Pascal; on the spiritual problem of anti-Semitism; and on symbolism and mysticism. The essays are a unity in virtue of the Thomist philosophy which pervades them: but this need not prevent those who are not Thomists from learning from them, since Thomism for M. Maritain is a way of thinking rather than a static body of doctrine. Is it permissible to trace the fact that M. Maritain's Thomism is so much more plastic than that of most Neo-Scholastics to the impact of Bergson's teaching? Both Maritain and his distinguished colleague M. Gilson began their study of philosophy at the feet of Bergson and passed on to Thomism through *l'expérience Bergsonienne*. Maritain's criticism of Bergson in two essays of this volume is a model of the rare art of constructive criticism of one system of thought from the standpoint of a very different system. Maritain brings out Bergson's great philosophical achievement—his description of a living process of spiritual growth—and disentangles this from the "irrationalism" which was an incidental and misleading deduction from it. The clue to the fruitfulness of M. Maritain's criticism is his appreciation that "at the heart of every great philosophic system there is (thus) a very simple yet inexhaustible insight . . . which on some occasion has overwhelmed the mind with its certitude. With every great philosopher there is a central intuition which in itself does not mislead" (p. 53). The question which those of us who are not Thomists may find ourselves asking is this: Is our knowledge of "Being" in the end compounded from the elucidation of such insights; or over and above this can we claim certain knowledge of the "laws of Being"? The Thomist claims the latter; but his doctrine of Being is in the end an analysis of the Aristotelian conception of actuality. The parting of the ways comes when we must decide whether or no this is an inevitable way of thinking and whether we can accept the direct realist epistemology which goes along with it.

Among the other essays, that on Pascal is timely in describing what Maritain calls "Christian cynicism" in a very great mind (a kind of cynicism of which we have plenty to-day in lesser minds than Pascal's), showing how this could encourage the forces making for despotic government. The essay on "The Mystery of Israel" shows how the problem of anti-Semitism must be faced at a profound theological level while at the same time encouraging the forces working for temporal alleviation. "The Jew is lost if he settles down, and by settling down I mean a spiritual phenomenon like the loss of a stimulating disquiet and the failure of a vocation. . . . Assimilation is not the solution of

Israel's problem, any more than is Yiddishism or Zionism; but assimilation, like autonomy and Zionism, is a partial accommodation, a compromise solution good and desirable to the extent that it is possible" (p. 144).

The essay "Who is my Neighbour?" discusses co-operation between members of different faiths, whether interconfessional Christian co-operation or co-operation between members of different world religions. M. Maritain holds that this cannot be based on "a common minimum of truth, or subjecting each one's convictions to a common index of doubt." Remaining wholly faithful to the truth as each one sees it, we must seek not common formulæ but *civic friendship* in facing the world's tasks; and above and beyond this, while facing the suffering brought by division, seek to meet one another in the grace of *charity*.

Manchester. Dorothy M. Emmet.

Interpreters of Man. By Gwilym O. Griffith. Lutterworth Press. 15s.

In approaching such a book as this, one is conscious of a certain initial prejudice to be overcome. Its real theme, the author informs us, is "The Decline of the Renaissance Man"; and it seeks to illustrate this theme with a series of brief studies of contrasted thinkers and personalities beginning with Hegel and ending with Barth, and covering a period which is stated to mark the last phase of Renaissance humanism. This mode of treatment incurs the risk of undue simplification and hasty generalization; and while suitable, perhaps, for dealing with publicists like H. G. Wells, who is included in the author's survey, is less adapted to the interpretation of master minds like Hegel and master spirits like Newman. One's prejudice, however, vanishes on reading the book, and, though certain criticisms remain unmet, the prevailing feeling is that of pleasure and stimulation in the fare provided. The reader is treated to a series of studies, remarkable for clarity of exposition and incisiveness of phrase, of Hegel, Schleiermacher, Kierkegaard, Mazzini, Newman, Nietzsche, Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, Ritschl, Harnack, Schweitzer, Spengler, Rathenau, Pareto, Wells, Bertrand Russell, Berdyaev, and Barth, with brief notes thrown in on Unamuno and Troeltsch. Thus, prevailing tendencies of thought in recent philosophy, theology, and political and social theory are outlined, and the impression certainly made very powerful that the Renaissance confidence in man's autonomous reason and the adequacy of man's mind and spirit both for truth and life is facing a bankruptcy which can no longer be hid even from the humanists themselves. In some respects the exposition seems almost too clear and cogent, and one is left wondering at the skill which can set out the substance of Hegel, Schleiermacher and Ritschl, for example, in a few pages. Nevertheless the layman in these matters is provided with a key which will enable him to unlock fortresses which were before securely shut to him.

It is possible of course to criticize some of the illustrations selected. Ritschl and Harnack are no doubt to be dated as theologians, but it is not at once clear that they are striking examples of the Renaissance

man. It seems to us that a study of Troeltsch, who is given only a brief note, would have been here more convincing, for Troeltsch in his conception of the transcendence of man's reason did decisively contend for its autonomy, and thus lead the way to that boundless historical relativism and scepticism which found its most frightening exponent in Spengler. Mr Griffith would doubtless retort that Ritschl founded a school and Troeltsch did not, and that Harnack, his most distinguished disciple, was to all Europe the representative of a Liberal Protestantism which is first cousin to humanism. True as that is, it scarcely meets the objection that to list in the Renaissance succession men who sought the norms of truth, not in man's reason and spirit but in historical event and revelation, is to take a course not free from ambiguity.

A further criticism will fasten on the omission of any American name from the series; for it is in certain American writers that the Renaissance autonomy and humanism lift up their heads most unblushingly. Mr Griffiith does well to emphasize that this Renaissance view of man must include religious man, and he is therefore amply justified in comprehending so many theologians in his survey. His longest chapter is devoted to Barth, of whose teaching he gives, on the whole, an admirable précis. Barth is, however, seen out of focus when an anti-humanist "mood" is declared to lie behind his theology. Mr Griffith has not allowed his thought to rest sufficiently on the very real Christian humanism which inheres in the Barthian theology; and, where he cannot escape it, is driven to regard it as a kind of foreign element. It is really time that the old stale criticism of Barthianism as involving a denial of man were abandoned, and that Barth were taken seriously in his claim to be "more humanist than the humanists." Mr. Griffith would do well to read again, *inter alia*, the lecture on "The Glory of God and of Man" in Barth's Gifford Lectures.

These criticisms notwithstanding, Mr Griffith's studies may be warmly commended both for their intrinsic interest and on account of the theme which they illustrate.

F. W. Camfield.

Totnes.

The Ideal Foundations of Economic Thought. By W. Stark. Kegan Paul. 15s.

Dr Stark traces the social philosophy which lies behind modern economic thought, to illustrate what he would call the decay of economic idealism as economics has become more mathematical. He argues that economics was part of the new cosmology which was built up 200 years after the decay of the medieval synthesis and of which Locke and Leibniz were largely the architects. Hence the classical economists argued for liberty and equality, and, because society was largely composed of small, independent producers with similar chances of success, it was possible to argue plausibly that their interests, apparently antagonistic, were in fact perfectly harmonized by an admirable mechanism; moreover, that such a society, built upon the free play of equal forces, was the best that reason could conceive. But the Industrial Revolution upset this balance of power; the choice

appeared to be either liberty and the economic productivity of large-scale capitalism or equality and economic stagnation. Thomas Hodgkin, a philosophical anarchist, is taken as an example of the first choice, and William Thompson, with his equalitarian collectivist utopia, of the second. Meanwhile the Deistic faith, which had a transcendental reference, gave way to positivism, the ideal of social harmony to that of individual happiness. Hermann Gossen and Richard Jennings are instances of this process. Now economics has abandoned any ideal at all. Economists shirk the issue of liberty and equality and say their subject is not concerned with a social philosophy, but is like a physical science. To Dr Stark this is a great betrayal, for economics should also deal with what *ought to be*; it should take note of the Golden Rule and its equalitarian implications.

On this two comments may be made. In the first place a most disappointing selection of thinkers has been chosen to illustrate the thesis. Only Locke had any general influence on the development of economic thought; four of the others are very minor and almost unknown figures. Ninety-eight per cent. of the book is taken up with exhausting quotations from these six authors. When one considers the key names he might have taken, it seems an opportunity missed. Secondly, the brief treatment of the underlying thesis is disappointing. It is true that modern economics says it deals with *given* scarce means used for *given* ends, yet it is unjust to imply that this refusal to consider ends is a deliberate shirking of the issue. Many economists who are most concerned about liberty and equality, many of them socialists, are keen to maintain this distinction. Dr Stark himself admits that many economic truths resemble mathematical propositions, though he ignores the immense intellectual clarification and progress made by "pure" economics. It is true, however, that value judgments come in fairly soon. They can be excluded in the logical analysis of economic causation, and largely so in the description and measurement of economic phenomena, but not from the formulation of policy. Often they enter unexamined and unrealized, yet they are of crucial importance. Are they, for example, to be on a positivist, humanist, or Christian basis? It is as important to get this issue clear as it is to engage on all three kinds of economic thought whilst at the same time keeping them intellectually distinct. Unfortunately Dr Stark neither formulates the problem clearly nor deals with it effectively.

London. Ronald Preston.

The School of Prayer. By Olive Wyon. S.C.M. Press. 6s.

Such books as this lend more support to the hope of Christian reunion than almost anything else, for, amongst all the talk and writing about "barriers to union" and so forth, the extremely tough barrier raised by our different conceptions of prayer seems to be almost always ignored. "This complicates the problem of reunion very considerably," remarks Dr Henson in his *Retrospect*, "for our venturous efforts to bring the two parties together are apt to have the untoward effect of increasing their mutual disgust!" Miss Wyon has

read very widely in the "Spiritual Classics" and it is to be hoped that her book will introduce many devout Protestants to teachers of prayer with whom they are as a general rule quite unfamiliar, such as Scupoli, Jeremy Taylor, de Caussade, Fr Baker, and their modern successors. For our own part we are grateful for an introduction to the eighteenth-century Gerhard Tersteegen, and hope that Miss Wyon may find time to translate *Der Weg in die Weite* for English readers.

There are useful sections in the book on "Prayer and Life," "Prayer and the Will of God," and "The Bible and Prayer," and a valuable section on the Prayer of Simplicity or Loving Regard. On a different plane, the writer deals shrewdly with "guidance," or "illuminism" as she calls it. One wonders, however, about her attitude to petition: is it possible that she looks down on it a little? It is significant that she stops short of this clause in her treatment of the Lord's Prayer. A fuller discussion of Thanksgiving would have added to the value of the book.

The author has nothing to say about Liturgical Prayer. She seems often to be leading up to it, and in the last chapter there is a reference to "praying in and with the Church," but it is not developed. We should like to have known what she makes of such writers as Guardini and Canon Ramsey.

Like a good many other writers, Miss Wyon quotes Rom. viii, 26 as if everyone could see at once what it means; but our experience is that most ordinary Christians find "groanings that cannot be uttered" a singularly baffling phrase. And is it so certain as she seems to assume (p. 15) that our Lord was one of many brothers and sisters? The Catholic Church does not think so, and Lightfoot's championship of the traditional view has yet to be adequately answered.

The book suffers a little from repetition and a tendency to discuss the same subject under different heads. Some examples given of the rewards of true prayer might possibly lead to the very materialistic view of it which the writer is anxious to avoid. But these are small blemishes, and we hope that the book will be widely read.

LLANDAFF. GLYN SIMON.

JESUS THE MESSIAH. THE SYNOPTIC TRADITION OF THE REVELATION OF GOD IN CHRIST; WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO FORM-CRITICISM. (The Cunningham Lectures, 1940.) By William Manson. Hodder and Stoughton. 8s. 6d.

This is an amazingly wise and sensible book. Professor Manson steers between the Scylla of the old Liberalism, which sought to eliminate from the Gospels all that did not represent Jesus as the loving human teacher of righteousness as a later accretion, and the Charybdis of the more recent German tendency to despair of history, and to reduce the Synoptic story to a mass of stories and sayings originating in the life of the early Church but giving us little or no reliable information as to the historical figure of the Lord from whom the Church took its origin. He does so with a grasp of historical probability and an insight into the mind of Jesus which enable us to see in the Gospels a true account of the working of God through Jesus on the plane of

history. His criticisms of the arbitrary and *a priori* assumptions of the more advanced school of Form-criticism are shrewd and piercing. Sometimes, indeed, he seems to allow them more value than they can really claim, as when he accepts the common view that the confused language of Mark ii, 10 indicates a conflation of two stories. In fact Mark is trying to do something which it is extremely difficult to do in narrative—namely, to express in direct speech what in a play would be expressed by the stage-direction "turning to the paralytic." How hard it is may be seen from Luke's story of the penitent thief, where Luke, a far more competent writer, can only indicate the penitent's transfer of his words from his fellow-thief to Jesus by inserting "And he said to him," which is perfectly futile since it does not tell us who was speaking to whom. But in general Dr Manson's exposure of the arbitrary methods of many form-critics in delimiting in advance what was or was not possible for the "prophetic consciousness" of Jesus, and in arguing that, because we can find a situation in the life of the early Church which might have produced a particular saying, we can therefore conclude that a particular saying was produced by the Church to meet that situation and has no basis in history, is masterly, as is also his refusal to be intimidated by the claim that any resemblance between the Gospel and non-Christian narratives must be "Hellenistic," as if Judaism had not been one of the chief contributors to that mixture of Greek and Oriental culture which we call Hellenistic.

In particular his treatment of the Messianic titles of Jesus and his insistence that they can only be traced in the last resort to Jesus Himself is extremely valuable. I am surprised that he does not notice Gressmann's important contribution to the question in *Der Messias*, in which he urges that the figure of the Servant in Second Isaiah is only intelligible as a prophetic revision of the traditional royal "Messiah" of Israelite court-poetry, modelled on that of the great world-empires, but transferred to the category of the prophets as exemplified by such figures as that of Jeremiah. I am also left unconvinced by Dr Manson's attempt to trace a development in the Messianic consciousness of Jesus as a result of which He only came at length to identify Himself with the "Son of Man." But I am very doubtful of all attempts to provide a meaning for the term either from Daniel or from 1 Enoch; it seems to me a deliberately ambiguous term intended to challenge the attention of the hearer.

There are valuable appendixes on the Targum on Isaiah liii, on the interconnexion of the Messianic titles, and on the alleged "Iranian myth" of the Heavenly Man; the last-named perhaps comes a little near to flogging a dead horse now that it is generally recognized that the Mandæan religion (apart perhaps from a few relics of paganism) is post-Christian.

This is a book which no serious student of the New Testament can ignore. The wise man will not be content to be without his own copy for frequent reference.

WILFRED L. KNOX.

CAMBRIDGE.

EVOLUTIONARY ETHICS. By Julian Huxley. The Romanes Lecture delivered in the Sheldonian Theatre, June 11, 1943. Oxford University Press. 2s.

This well printed publication is worth reading if for no other reason than that of learning the prejudices with which some biologists approach a subject having theological and metaphysical aspects. It is no purpose of the reviewer to try to give a précis of the lecture and it is unfair to judge the colloquial style of a lecture from the point of view of precise writing designed in the first place for reading.

The lecture is slightly marred by rather childish, and in some cases ill informed, gibes at theology and religion, together with a tendency to substitute mild abuse of an author or class of authors for a reasoned criticism of their work (see pp. 20 and 49). Dr Huxley would have been well advised to take more seriously the warning he himself gives in the footnote on p. 42 and to remember, apropos of his criticism on p. 20, that in the last resort even "the irrational and compulsive elements in conscience" have to be judged and considered by an "activity of the faculty of reason." There is little in the positive content of the lecture which is not the commonplace of moral theology; and it is a pity that the lecturer is inclined to obscure this fact by a misleading and rather meaningless use of the terms static and dynamic (see for instance p. 55 —"our ethical yardstick is itself dynamic"). Again, Dr Huxley, in common with other exponents of evolution, tends to repudiate the concept of purpose while retaining its meaning under various disguises (*e.g.*, on p. 39). There is no clear recognition of the necessary distinction between the actual content of a given ethical judgment and the fundamental discrimination between values and their contraries which is applied in every ethical judgment; and until this is made the real relations of ethics and science will not be discovered. One day it may occur to a writer from the point of view of science on this topic that the conviction of God (by no means "static") is the master key to the problem.

CAMBRIDGE. C. D. WADDAMS.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ADELPHI PLAYERS: R. H. Ward, *The Destiny of Man* (2s.).
BURNS OATES: B. Kelly, *The Kingdom Come* (9s.); A. Day, *Our Friends the Jews* (3s. 6d.).
EAST AND WEST LIBRARY: E. Berkovits, *Towards Historic Judaism* (5s.); C. Roth, *The Jewish Contribution to Civilisation* (5s. 6d.); C. Roth, *A Short History of the Jewish People* (5s. 6d.).
FRIENDS' HOME SERVICE COMMITTEE: H. E. Collier, *The Quaker Meeting* (9d.).
GREY WALLS PRESS: Franz Werfel, *Paul among the Jews* (6s.).
HIGHWAY PRESS: P. L. Garlick, *The Wholeness of Man* (6s.).
LONGMANS: R. S. Wright, *The Greater Victory* (3s. 6d.); Charles Williams (ed.), *The Letters of Evelyn Underhill* (10s. 6d.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher